

1 TRINETTE G. KENT (State Bar No. 222020)
2 10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-192
3 Phoenix, AZ 85028
4 Telephone: (480) 247-9644
5 Facsimile: (480) 717-4781
6 E-mail: tkent@lemborglaw.com

7 Of Counsel to
8 Lemberg Law, LLC
9 A Connecticut Law Firm
10 43 Danbury Road
11 Wilton, CT 06897
12 Telephone: (203) 653-2250
13 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
15 Ziyad Zreik

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 WESTERN DIVISION

19 Ziyad Zreik,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 Charter Communications, Inc.,

23 Defendant.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FOR VIOLATIONS OF:

- 1. THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT;**
- 2. THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff, Ziyad Zreik (hereafter “Plaintiff”), by undersigned counsel, brings the
2 following complaint against Charter Communications, Inc. (hereafter “Defendant”)
3 and alleges as follows:
4

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. This action arises out of Defendant’s repeated violations of the
7 Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* (“TCPA”), and repeated
8 violations of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788,
9 *et seq.* (“Rosenthal Act”).
10

11 2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3), Cal. Civ.
12 Code 1788.30(f), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
13

14 3. Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), where
15 the acts and transactions giving rise to Plaintiff’s action occurred in this district and/or
16 where Defendant transacts business in this district.
17

18 **PARTIES**

19 4. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing in Burbank, California, and is a
20 “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).
21

22 5. Plaintiff is a “debtor” as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h).
23

24 6. Defendant is a business entity located in St. Louis, Missouri, and is a
25 “person” as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code §
26 1788.2(g).
27
28

1 7. Defendant, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of
2 itself or others, engages in the collection of consumer debts, and is a “debt collector”
3
4 as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).

5
6 **ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

7 8. Plaintiff is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt asserted to
8 be owed to Defendant.

9
10 9. Plaintiff’s alleged obligation arises from a transaction in which property,
11 services or money was acquired on credit primarily for personal, family or household
12 purposes and is a “consumer debt” as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).

13
14 10. At all times mentioned herein where Defendant communicated with any
15 person via telephone, such communication was done via Defendant’s agent,
16 representative or employee.

17
18 11. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff utilized a cellular telephone
19 service and was assigned the following telephone number: 818-XXX-7676 (hereafter
20 “Number”).

21
22 12. Defendant placed calls to Plaintiff’s Number in an attempt to collect a
23 debt.

24
25 13. The aforementioned calls were placed using an automatic telephone
26 dialing system (“ATDS”) and/or by using an artificial or prerecorded voice
27 (“Robocalls”).
28

14. Upon answering Defendant's calls, Plaintiff heard a significant period of dead air prior to being connected to a live representative.

15. In August of 2016, Plaintiff spoke with a live agent and demanded Defendant cease calling her Number.

16. Despite Plaintiff's unequivocal demand, Defendant continued calling Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS at an excessive and harassing rate.

17. Defendant's calls directly and substantially interfered with Plaintiff's right to peacefully enjoy a service that Plaintiff paid for and caused Plaintiff to suffer a significant amount of anxiety, frustration and annoyance.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 47
U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.

19. The TCPA prohibits Defendant from using, other than for emergency purposes, an ATDS and/or Robocalls when calling Plaintiff's Number absent Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

20. Defendant's telephone system has the earmark of using an ATDS in that Plaintiff, upon answering calls from Defendant, heard approximately significant period of dead air prior to a live agent coming on the line.

21. Defendant called Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS without Plaintiff's consent in that Defendant either never had Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so or such consent was effectively revoked when Plaintiff requested that Defendant cease all further calls.

22. Defendant continued to willfully call Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS knowing that it lacked the requisite consent to do so in violation of the TCPA.

23. Plaintiff was harmed and suffered damages as a result of Defendant's actions.

24. The TCPA creates a private right of action against persons who violate the Act. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

25. As a result of each call made in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages.

26. As a result of each call made knowingly and/or willingly in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff may be entitled to an award of treble damages.

COUNT II

**VIOLATIONS OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION
PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq.**

27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.

28. The Rosenthal Act was passed to prohibit debt collectors from engaging in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.

1 29. Defendant caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously
2 to annoy Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(d).

3
4 30. Defendant communicated with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be
5 unreasonable, constituting harassment, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(e).

6
7 31. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's
8 violations.

9
10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant for:

12 A. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each call determined to be in violation
13 of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);

14 B. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or
15 knowing under the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);

16 C. Actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);

17 D. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for knowingly and willfully committing
18 violations pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);

19 E. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Cal. Civ.
20 Code § 1788.30(c);

21 F. Punitive damages; and

22 G. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: January 31, 2017

TRINETTE G. KENT

By: /s/ Trinette G. Kent
Trinette G. Kent, Esq.
Lemberg Law, LLC
Attorney for Plaintiff, Ziyad Zreik